

# Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

## Hennepin Conservation District FY09 EQIP

### 1. List the local resource concerns that EQIP can address:

Water Quality  
Nutrient and sediment loading to surface waters  
Use exclusion and management  
Feedlots  
CNMP  
BMP's (clean water diversions, roof runoff, etc)  
Lack of buffers in waters of the state  
Declining Wildlife habitat  
Invasive species  
Declining greenway corridors and natural areas  
Surface water Runoff  
Sensitive groundwater areas

### 2. If applicable, list any geographic regions (i.e. watersheds, townships, etc.) and their respective resource concerns within the District to receive priority:

Watersheds, City/Township identified plans, and WMO's with draft/approved 509 plans and identified greenway corridors.

### 3. From items 1 & 2 above prioritize the local resource concerns to be addressed with EQIP funding for the district. Describe a minimum of 3 categories of the highest priority applications which you would want to receive funding.

#### Prioritize Local Resource Concerns

1. All Impaired Waters Listed for Hennepin County
2. Sensitive groundwater areas
3. Water Quality
4. Sediment loading
5. Use exclusion
6. CNMP
7. Feedlot management
8. Buffers state waters
9. Declining Wildlife habitat
10. Invasive species
11. Declining greenway corridors and natural areas
12. Surface water Runoff

### 4. Develop a minimum of 3 and maximum of 12 yes/no questions to determine if an application is addressing the high priority concerns described in item 3.

	Question:	Points
1.	<u>Soil Erosion</u> : Will the practice reduce sheet and rill erosion < T?	5
2.	<u>Water Quality</u> : Will the practice reduce nutrient loading, sediment loading or manure impacts to surface water?	5
3.	<u>Water Quality</u> : Is the practice located within 500 ft of receiving water (surface water)?	5
4.	<u>Water Quality (additional 5 points)</u> : Is the practice located <= 100 ft of receiving water (surface water)?	5
5.	<u>Habitat</u> : Improve habitat within identified greenway corridor?	5
6.	<u>Habitat</u> : Will the practice improve riparian habitat?	5
7.	<u>Habitat</u> : Will drained or degraded wetlands be addressed?	5
8.	<u>Water Quality</u> : Does practice filter contaminants that may enter adjacent open waterbodies?	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>

5. **Assign points to the questions in Item #4 as desired to reflect local priorities. The total points assigned to the questions must equal exactly 40 points.**

Refer to question 4, column 3.

6. **Submit this worksheet to your respective ASTC(FO). After approval from the state office, the questions will be entered into the Local Issues section of the ranking tool.**

Worksheet submitted to Timothy Wilson; ASTC(FO) of Area 4.

7. **List any recommended practices to be deleted from the state Conservation Practice Payment Document.**

None

**The local EQIP program description, cost-share docket changes, and ranking worksheet must be reviewed and approved by the State Conservationist before any EQIP contract is approved and signed.**

**This document serves as the Local Work Group recommendation for FY 09 EQIP. Below is a roster of participation in the Local Work Group.**

Stacey Lijewski

11-10-08

---

**Chair, Local Work Group**

**Date**

**Roster:**

Kim Boyce, HCD Board Chair

Mike Wyatt , HCD Board Vice-Chair

Dan Jones, HCD Board Secretary

Stephen Jenkins, HCD Board Treasurer

Phil Willkie, HCD Board Public Relations

James Wisker, Guest

Joel Settles, HES Supervisor

Stacey Lijewski, HES Staff

Mary Monte (NRCS, District Conservationist)